

REMARKS

Claims 1-64 were pending in the application.

Claims 1-60 were allowed.

Claims 61 and 63 were rejected.

Claims 62 and 64 were objected to.

Claim 61 has been canceled.

Claims 62-64 have been amended.

Claims 65-70 have been added.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-70 is respectfully requested in view of the following.

Information Disclosure Statements

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the Information Disclosure Statements previously filed on July 14, 2003, August 25, 2003, August 4, 2004 and January 5, 2005.

The Rejection of Claims 61 and 63:

Claims 61 and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toon et al. (US 5,195,583). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 61 has been canceled and claim 63 has been amended to depend from the previously indicated allowable subject matter of claim 62, now presented in independent form. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 61 and 63 is now moot.

The Objection To Claims 62 and 64:

Claims 62 and 64 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 62 and 64 have been amended to present their respective subject matter in independent form.

Thus, claims 62 and 64 are now allowable.

Claims 1-60:

The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 1-60.

New Claims 65-70:

Claims 65-70 present additional aspects of the present invention that are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Unless stated otherwise, none of the amendment to the claims were made for reasons substantially related to the statutory requirements for patentability.

Furthermore, unless stated otherwise, the amendment to the claims were made to simply make express what had been implicit in the claims as originally worded and therefore is not a narrowing amendment that would create any type of prosecution history estoppel. In addition, to the extent that formerly dependent claims are now presented in independent form, such amendments do not constitute a narrowing amendment that surrenders any subject matter.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and allow claims presented for reconsideration herein. To the extent that the present amendment results in additional fees, the Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account no. 08-1394.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Todd Mattingly
Registration No. 40,298

Dated: 8/1/2005

HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 713/547-2301
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
File: 25791.292

H-561905_1.DOC

EXPRESS MAIL NO.: EV702333725US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: August 1, 2005

This paper and fee are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Stacy Lanier

Name of person mailing paper and fee

Signature of person mailing paper and fee